



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,078	03/30/2006	Kaoru Yokota	2006_0442A	8708
52349 7590 01/08/2010 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P. 1030 15th Street, N.W. Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503				
EXAMINER				
KIM, KEVIN Y				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/08/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/574,078

Applicant(s)

YOKOTA ET AL.

Examiner

KEVIN Y. KIM

Art Unit

3714

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 11-18, 22, 23, 25 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 11-18, 22, 23, 25 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/22/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 11, 16, 18, 22-23, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taho et al (US 2001/0029205 A1) in view of Eguchi et al (US 6,951,516 B1) and Stern (US 2003/0054884 A1).

3. Re claim 1, Taho discloses a game system comprising:

a stationary game execution apparatus (figure 1, 20), a monitor (figure 1, 50),
the stationary game execution apparatus including:

an obtaining unit operable to obtain the game program and general image data,
the game program indicating a game procedure, and the general image data being for
display in accordance with progression of the game (figure 1, 24 and figure 3, 60-62,
wherein game program consists of both game data and graphics data);

a write unit operable to write the obtained game program to a portable recording
medium (figure 1, 28);

a generation unit operable to generate stationary image data from the obtained
general data, the stationary image data being suitable for display by the stationary
game execution apparatus (figure 1, 22);

a transmission unit operable to transmit data over a network (figure 1, 24);

an input unit operable to receive an input operation from a user (figure 1, 40);
and

an execution unit operable to execute, based on the received input operation, the game, in accordance with the procedure indicated by the obtained game program, and generate, in accordance with progression of the game, a stationary display image from the generated stationary image data, and output the generated stationary display image (figure 1, 21),

the monitor displaying the output stationary display image (figure 1, 50).

However, Taho is silent on a portable game execution apparatus, wherein a generation unit generates portable image data suitable for display by the portable game apparatus, a read, reception, input, execution, and display unit. Eguchi teaches a video game system that allows users to download video game data into a handheld video game device (column 13, lines 30-43). As the portable device is capable of playing games, it inherently contains the execution, display, and input units as disclosed above. Additionally, Eguchi teaches that the use of networks to download game data is well known (column 13, lines 7-29).

Taho and Eguchi do not disclose the game program not including any general image data. Stern teaches storing graphics information on a separate graphic server (paragraph [0022]). Thus, even if the graphics may be for separate functions (for example, ads, images, multimedia presentations), this teaching shows that one skilled in the art would be able to separate any amount of image data from a program, and thus, one skilled in the art would have found it obvious to have a game program that

does not include image data in order to lower the size of the program and separately store the graphics data for easy access and convenience.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tahoe with the methods of Eguchi to allow portable devices to download image data in order to allow players to use their portable gaming devices to transport game data, while also allowing them to play a related game with said data on the portable devices.

4. Re claim 11, see rejection to claim 1, *mutatis mutandis*.
5. Re claim 16, see rejection to claim 9.
6. Re claims 18, 22-23, and 25, see rejection to claim 1, *mutatis mutandis*.
7. Re claim 26, having the revised game program prepared by a vendor of the game program is an obvious design choice, as one skilled in the art has good reason to allow the creator and vendors of the programs being used to modify the programs appropriately in order to perform their specified functions.
8. Claims 2, 12-15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahoe in view of Eguchi as applied to claims 1, 3, and 11 above, and further in view of Xidos et al (US 5,851,149).
9. Re claim 2, Tahoe discloses a distribution server (figure 1, 30), including:
 - a storage unit operable to store the game program (figure 3, 33);
 - a read unit operable to read the game program from the storage unit (figure 3,both RAM 25 and memory card 60 are able to take data from the storage unit, and thus,

it is inherent that there is a read unit);

a transmission unit operable to transmit the read game program securely over the network (figure 2, 36),

wherein a game execution unit further includes:

a reception unit operable to receive the game program over the network (figure 1, 24); and

a write unit operable to write the received game program to a medium (figure 1, 28).

There is no disclosure as discussed above of a portable game execution apparatus in Tahoe, or instead of the stationary apparatus writing the game program to the portable recording medium, the mobile game execution apparatus writes the game program to a portable recording medium.

Eguchi has been discussed above regarding a portable game apparatus. Since Tahoe discloses a game apparatus with networking capabilities, and Eguchi teaches portable game apparatuses and networking capabilities, one skilled in the art would find it obvious to implement the networking capability discussed above into a portable game apparatus in order to allow a portable game device to have similar functionality to a standard game apparatus.

Furthermore, Eguchi teaches that the portable game device that is using portable recording medium may act as repository for data exchange between the two video game platforms (column 13, lines 39-43). Thus, the mobile game execution apparatus must be able to write a game program to a portable recording medium in order to allow

the device to act as a repository, allowing users to store data onto the portable device in order to later write the data onto the stationary device.

Finally, the above are silent on transmitting the program securely. Xidos teaches using key cryptography to encrypt information being transmitted over a network (column 34, lines 14-28). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to encrypt information being transmitted in order to prevent hackers from easily accessing and intercepting transmitted data.

10. Re claims 12-15, see the above rejections. It is inherent that the generated key in key cryptography matches on both sides of a network – otherwise, the data would not be able to be decrypted and would be unusable. It would have been obvious to use key cryptography in order to ensure transmitted data is secure.

11. Re claim 17, see rejection to claim 10.

12. Re claim 18, see rejection to claim 2, *mutatis mutandis*.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN Y. KIM whose telephone number is (571)270-3215. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 571-272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John M Hotaling II/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714

/K. Y. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 3714